

Remarks

Applicants thank the Examiner for returning the signed and initialed copy of the PTO-1449 form corresponding to the Information Disclosure Statements filed on March 15, 2005.

Claims 65-92 are pending in this application. Claims 33-64 are cancelled without prejudice and without disclaimer. Claims 65-92 are newly added. No new subject matter has been added. In view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks, allowance of all the claims pending in the application is requested.

Examiner Interview

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended to Applicants' representative in granting a telephonic interview on September 14, 2005. In that interview, the Examiner acknowledged that, in light of the Election/Restriction requirement made by the Examiner that left no claims pending in the application, the finality of the Office Action mailed June 30, 2005 ("the 6/30/2005 Office Action") was improper and that a Notice of a Non-Compliant Amendment should have been issued. In accordance with the agreement reached during the interview, Applicants have hereby cancelled the claims subject to the Election/Restriction requirement, and have added a new set of claims that correspond more closely with original claims 1-32. In particular, newly added independent claims 65, 72, 79, and 86 include subject matter similar to the subject matter recited original independent claims 1, 9, 17, and 25, respectively. Claims 65, 72, 79, and 85 also include additional subject matter, intended to clarify differences between the claimed invention and the cited references.

Newly Added Claims

Claims 65-92 are newly added and are distinguishable over the cited references for the following reasons. Independent claim 65 recites, among other things, generating a mobile design element based on the accessed form and the style sheet associated with the wireless client device. Independent claims 72, 79, and 86 include similar subject matter, among other things.

In an exemplary embodiment, a database designer may define one or more applications in a database, which may include creating an application digest in the database as a design element (see the Specification at page 31, lines 3-6). The database may also store other design elements, such as forms, views, help, etc. (see the Specification at page 31, lines 11-14). The application digest may hold information regarding the application and a copy of mobile design elements used by the mobile application in a format required or desired by a wireless client device (see the Specification at page 31, lines 7-9). A compiler may automatically generate the mobile design elements from other design elements in the database (see the Specification at page 31, lines 10-14).

Jain appears to be drawn to a system for searching form information on the Internet that enables a search engine being run on a web server to search bookmarks stored within a user's browser (see Jain at col. 2, lines 55-59). Jain teaches that this functionality is enabled by sending a list of bookmarks stored within the user's browser to the search engine with each search request (see Jain at col. 2, lines 59-64). Transmission of the user's bookmarks with the search request may enable a "personalized" search result to be provided by the search engine. However, Jain is silent with respect to the generation of a mobile design element for formatting content prior to transmission from the server to the client. Therefore, Jain does not teach or suggest generating a mobile design element based on the accessed form and the style sheet associated with the wireless client device.

The Examiner admits that Jain does not teach storing a file remotely from the wireless client device, but seeks to cure this deficiency by combining Jain with Holt. Holt apparently discloses a system and method for augmenting searches for data with public search engines by submitting searches to special purpose search resources, such as search capabilities provided by private companies, universities, and government web pages (see Holt at the Abstract and col. 5, lines 11-45). However, Holt does not address the shortcomings of Jain addressed above. Therefore, Jain and Holt, both alone and in combination fail to teach or suggest all of the features of the claimed invention.

Customer Number
00909

Application Serial No.: 09/885,139
Attorney Docket No.: 042846-0312947
Reply and Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. §1.116

Accordingly, independent claims 65, 72, 79, and 86 are allowable over the cited prior art. Claims 66-71, 73-78, 80-84, and 87-92 depend from corresponding ones of independent claims 65, 72, 79, and 86, and therefore are allowable based on their dependency as well as for the features that they add to the independent claims.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Dated: September 19, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Sean L. Ingram', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Sean L. Ingram
Registration No.: 48,283
PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
1600 Tysons Blvd.
McLean, Virginia 22102
703-905-2000